



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/566,001

01/20/2006

Andre Postma

NL 030887

9378

24737

7590

11/05/2010

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

YU, HENRY W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2182

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/05/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/566,001	Applicant(s) POSTMA ET AL.	
	Examiner HENRY YU	Art Unit 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

INFORMATION CONCERNING RESPONSES

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's communication filed on September 7, 2010, in response to PTO Office Action mailed on July 6, 2010. The Applicant's remarks and amendments to the claims and/or the specification were considered with the results that follow.
2. In response to the last Office Action, **claims 1 and 9** have been amended. As a result, **claims 1-19** are now pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on September 7, 2010, in response to PTO Office Action mailed on July 6, 2010, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Hence, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further review a new ground of rejection has been made in view of Chiles et al. (Patent Number US 6,581,157 B1).

REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2182

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, and 12-13, and 18-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strierner (Patent Number US 6,931,463 B2) in view of DeGeorge (Publication Number US 2003/0135868 A1) and Chiles et al. (Patent Number US 6,581,157 B1).

As per **claim 1**, Strierner discloses “*an...system comprising one or more functionality devices (companion device that provides non-native function to a different electronic device; Column 1, lines 54-56) and an... device adapted so that the one or more functionality devices are locatable in proximity to the...device (Column 1, lines 59-65).*”

Strierner also discloses “*the...device being operable to recognize the presence of the one or more functionality devices (Column 1, lines 59-62), and, upon recognition of said one or more functionality devices, the...device being updateable with and operable to perform one or more additional functionality features associated with said one or more functionality devices and which are non-standard features of said...device (Abstract, lines 1-2) whilst said one or more functionality devices are in proximity to the...device (Column 1, lines 62-67; Column 2, lines 1-7)*” and “*based on the proximity of the one or more functionality devices to the entertainment device (see FIG. 4 as it relates to the device 410 and companion device 490).*”

However, Strierner does not explicitly disclose that the device in question is an “*entertainment device.*”

DeGeorge discloses an entertainment device that is capable of obtaining additional features **[Page 4, paragraph 0036]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine elements of Strierner and DeGeorge. It is noted that both Strierner and DeGeorge disclose systems which are capable of being updated by external means (functionality devices in the case of Strierner and data encoded in an outside signal in the case of DeGeorge). DeGeorge further states that it may be desirable to change the operating characteristics of a system (in this case a television receiver) through various means including the use of a smart card **[Page 1, paragraphs 0003-0004]**. Such an ability to change the operating characteristics of a system can enable a user to obtain additional features or to fix errors in existing systems program code **[Page 4, paragraph 0036]**, and hence provide greater flexibility.

Neither Strierner nor DeGeorge explicitly disclose one set of features/modules' being operable/compatible with additional/future sets of features/modules as disclosed in the limitation "*wherein standard features of the entertainment device are configured to be (i) concurrently operable with the one or more additional functionality features and (ii) selectively updateable by the one or more additional functionality features, such that the entertainment device automatically recognizes, accepts, and carries out the non-standard features of the one or more functionality devices.*"

Chiles et al. discloses "*wherein standard features of the entertainment device are configured to be (i) concurrently operable with the one or more additional functionality features and (ii) selectively updateable by the one or more additional functionality*

Art Unit: 2182

features (use of previous versions (implying standard features currently available) of the device may enjoy the benefits of new features available; Column 3, lines 26-33), such that the entertainment device automatically recognizes, accepts, and carries out the non-standard features of the one or more functionality devices (note that the updates are done automatically; Column 3, lines 24-25)."

As for Chiles et al., such an ability to add additional features on top of existing standard features allows for greater flexibility as well as precluding the need to replace the device [Column 3, lines 10-12].

As per claim 3, the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al., discloses "the system" (see rejection to claim 1 above). Strierner further discloses "at least one of said one or more functionality devices (**companion device**) and the...device (**from the companion device's perspective, a different electronic device**) are operable to communicate via wireless communication by using an electromagnetic signal (**Column 1, lines 56-59**)."

As per claim 4, the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al., discloses "the system" (see rejection to claim 1 above). Strierner further discloses "the electromagnetic signal is implemented using electromagnetic radiation complying with the Bluetooth standard (**Column 1, lines 56-59**)."

As per claim 5, the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al., discloses "the system" (see rejection to claim 1 above). Strierner further discloses "access to the one or more additional functionality features of said one or more functionality devices is conditional upon activation of the one or more functionality

devices (from the electronic device's perspective, in order to activate the functions of the companion device a link must established, along with the proper authentication and authorization information; Column 5, lines 1-17)."

As per **claim 7**, the combination of Striemer, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al., discloses "the system" (see rejection to **claim 1** above). Striemer further discloses "at least one of said one or more functionality devices is activated by using electromagnetic signal communication with an additional device (**through the use of a local wireless interface in conjunction with identification mechanism; Column 5, lines 3-9**)."

As per **claim 8**, the combination of Striemer, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al., discloses "the system" (see rejection to **claim 1** above). Striemer further discloses "the activation is conditional upon communication of one or more codes (**in order to establish a link, and hence from the electronic device's perspective activate the functionality of the companion device, authentication and authorization information are required; Column 5, lines 9-14**)."

As per **claim 9**, Striemer discloses "a method of providing additional functionality to an...device, the method including the steps of: (a) providing an...device operable to performing a set of functions (**Column 1, lines 59-65**)" and "(b) providing at least one functionality device adapted so as to be engagable in at least close spatial proximity to the...device (**Column 1, lines 59-65**)."

Striemer also discloses "(c) arranging for said...device to be capable of recognizing the presence of said at least one functionality device when in close spatial proximity to the...device (**Column 1, lines 59-65**)" and "(d) arranging for the...device to

*be updated with and to perform one or more additional functionality features associated with said at least one functionality device and which are non-standard features of said...device (**Abstract, lines 1-2**)” and “based on the proximity of the one or more functionality devices to the entertainment device (**see FIG. 4 as it relates to the device 410 and companion device 490**).”*

However, Striemer does not explicitly disclose that the device in question is an “*entertainment device*.”

DeGeorge discloses an entertainment device that is capable of obtaining additional features [**Page 4, paragraph 0036**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine elements of Striemer and DeGeorge. It is noted that both Striemer and DeGeorge disclose systems which are capable of being updated by external means (functionality devices in the case of Striemer and data encoded in an outside signal in the case of DeGeorge). DeGeorge further states that it may be desirable to change the operating characteristics of a system (in this case a television receiver) through various means including the use of a smart card [**Page 1, paragraphs 0003-0004**]. Such an ability to change the operating characteristics of a system can enable a user to obtain additional features or to fix errors in existing systems program code [**Page 4, paragraph 0036**], and hence provide greater flexibility.

Neither Striemer nor DeGeorge explicitly disclose one set of features/modules’ being operable/compatible with additional/future sets of features/modules as disclosed in the limitation “*wherein standard features of the entertainment device are configured to*

be (i) concurrently operable with the one or more additional functionality features and (ii) selectively updateable by the one or more additional functionality features, such that the entertainment device automatically recognizes, accepts, and carries out the non-standard features of the one or more functionality devices.”

Chiles et al. discloses one set of features/modules' being operable/compatible with additional/future sets of features/modules as disclosed in the limitation “*wherein standard features of the entertainment device are configured to be (i) concurrently operable with the one or more additional functionality features **(use of previous versions (implying standard features currently available) of the device may enjoy the benefits of new features available; Column 3, lines 26-33)** and (ii) selectively updateable by the one or more additional functionality features, such that the entertainment device automatically recognizes, accepts, and carries out the non-standard features of the one or more functionality devices **(note that the updates are done automatically; Column 3, lines 24-25).***”

As for Chiles et al., such an ability to add additional features on top of existing standard features allows for greater flexibility as well as precluding the need to replace the device [**Column 3, lines 10-12**].

As per **claim 12**, the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses “*the method*” (see rejection to **claim 9** above). Strierner further discloses “*said at least one functionality device **(companion device)** and said...device **(from the companion device’s perspective, a different electronic device)** are arranged to*

mutually communicate via wireless communication utilizing an electromagnetic signal (Column 1, lines 56-59)."

As per **claim 13**, the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses "*the method*" (see rejection to **claim 9** above). Strierner further discloses "*the electromagnetic signal complies with the Bluetooth standard (Column 1, lines 56-59).*"

As per **claim 18**, the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses "*the system*" (see rejection to **claim 1** above). DeGeorge further discloses "*said entertainment device is selected from the group consisting of a DVD player and a television (Page 3, paragraph 0033).*"

As per **claim 19**, the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses "*the method*" (see rejection to **claim 9** above). DeGeorge further discloses "*said entertainment device is selected from the group consisting of a DVD player and a television (Page 3, paragraph 0033).*"

6. **Claims 2, 6, and 10-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strierner (Patent Number US 6,931,463 B2), DeGeorge (Publication Number US 2003/0135868 A1), and Chiles et al. (Patent Number US 6,581,157 B1) in view of Henrie et al. (Patent Number US 6,519,144 B1).

As per **claim 2**, while the combination Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses "*the system*" (see rejection to **claim 1** above), the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. does not explicitly disclose physical coupling/attachment as disclosed in "*at least one of said one or more functionality devices is arranged to be*

attachable to the entertainment device by means of at least one of a magnetic coupling, a suction pad, an adhesive coupling and a mechanical attachment mechanism."

Henrie et al. explicitly disclose physical coupling/attachment as "*at least one of said one or more functionality devices (**in one embodiment the cradle 2000**) is arranged to be attachable to the (entertainment) device (**PDA 100**) by means of at least one of a magnetic coupling, a suction pad, an adhesive coupling and a mechanical attachment mechanism (**the PDA 100 is physically connected to the cradle 2000 through an electrical connector 181; FIG. 11F and 13**).*"

Strierner, DeGeorge, Chiles et al., and Henrie et al. are analogous art in that they are from the same field of device interfacing, particularly of peripheral devices to a main device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the system as disclosed by the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. with physical coupling/attachment as disclosed by Henrie et al., since such attachments can not only ensure that a user has all the necessary equipment without concern for a missing component, but also ensure greater security (as wireless signals can be intercepted by outside parties) and less interference, as opposed to wireless signal interfacing.

As per **claim 6**, while the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses "*the system*" (see rejection to **claim 1** above), the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. does not explicitly disclose "*said one or more functionality devices are activated in response to actuation of a switch or button on the device,*"

Art Unit: 2182

which Henrie et al. discloses as “*said one or more functionality devices are activated in response to actuation of a switch or button on said functionality devices (the cradle 2000 contains a hot synch button which, when pressed, provides for 'Hot Synch' enablement of the cradle 2000; Column 11, lines 22-27).*”

Strierner, DeGeorge, Chiles et al., and Henrie et al. are analogous art in that they are from the same field of device interfacing, particularly of peripheral devices to a main device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the system as disclosed by the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. with device activation through a button or switch as disclosed by Henrie et al., which gives the user more control and flexibility with regard to device/peripheral activation as opposed to having the system automatically do so. Furthermore, such user-determined activation can also allow for the saving of electrical power on the device/peripheral if such device/peripheral runs on a battery. The button/switch is press/actuated only when the user actually needs/desires to operationally connect the device/peripheral.

As per **claim 10**, while the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses “*the method*” (see rejection to **claim 9** above), the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. does not explicitly disclose “*close spatial proximity corresponds to physical contact between said entertainment device and said at least one functionality device,*” which Henrie et al discloses as “*close spatial proximity corresponds to physical contact between said entertainment device and said at least*

one functionality device (the PDA 100 is physically connected to the cradle 2000 through an electrical connector 181; FIG. 11F and 13)."

Strierner, DeGeorge, Chiles et al., and Henrie et al. are analogous art in that they are from the same field of device interfacing, particularly of peripheral devices to a main device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the method as disclosed by the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. with physical coupling/attachment as disclosed by Henrie et al. (see rejection to **claim 2** above for motivation).

As per **claim 11**, while the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses "the method" (see rejection to **claim 9** above), the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. does not explicitly disclose "said at least one functionality device is attached to the entertainment device by means of at least one of a magnetic coupling, a suction pad, an adhesive coupling and a mechanical attachment mechanism," which Henrie et al. discloses as "said at least one functionality device is attached to the entertainment device by means of at least one of a magnetic coupling, a suction pad, an adhesive coupling and a mechanical attachment mechanism (**the cradle 2000 contains a hot synch button which, when pressed, provides for 'Hot Synch' enablement of the cradle 2000; Column 11, lines 22-27**)."

Strierner, DeGeorge, Chiles et al., and Henrie et al. are analogous art in that they are from the same field of device interfacing, particularly of peripheral devices to a main device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the method as disclosed by the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. with physical coupling/attachment as disclosed by Henrie et al. (see rejection to **claim 2** above for motivation).

7. **Claims 14 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strierner (Patent Number US 6,931,463 B2), DeGeorge (Publication Number US 2003/0135868 A1), and Chiles et al. (Patent Number US 6,581,157 B1) in view of Silvester (Publication Number US 2003/0068034 A1).

As per **claim 14**, while the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses “the system” (see rejection to **claim 5** above), Silvester discloses the idea of latent functionality features being present in an entertainment device that are augmented by upgrade modules as “*wherein the one or more additional functionality features are latently present in said entertainment device and access to said additional functionality is available while one or more functionality devices are attached (modules may provide added functionality such as additional memory, additional processing, and the like (Abstract; Lines 3-6). The use of the term “added” indicates augmentation of current functions in the device, such as memory and processing in this instance).*”

Strierner, DeGeorge, Chiles et al., and Silvester are analogous art in that they are from the same field of device interfacing, particularly of peripheral devices to a main device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the method as disclosed by the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. with elements of Silvester, which notes that when a user decides to upgrade to a more advanced device, the existing device becomes largely useless. This is compounded by the fact that the resale value of basic devices is relatively limited **[Page 1, paragraph 0002]**. Hence, in order to prolong the lifespan of the basic device and have the basic device remain useful to the user in the face of increasing technological advancement, the use of modules that augments the basic device can be of great use.

As per **claim 17**, while the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses “the system” (see rejection to **claim 5** above), Silvester discloses “*wherein the one or more additional functionality features are made available to said entertainment device from an external storage medium after attachment of the one or more functionality devices (the card 66 contains a storage 58 that includes software; Page 1, paragraph 0016; FIG. 3).*”

Strierner, DeGeorge, Chiles et al. and Silvester are analogous art in that they are from the same field of device interfacing, particularly of peripheral devices to a main device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the method as disclosed by the combination of Strierner, DeGeorge, and Hilgen with elements of Silvester, which notes that when a user decides to upgrade to a more advanced device, the existing device becomes largely useless.

This is compounded by the fact that the resale value of basic devices is relatively limited **[Page 1, paragraph 0002]**. Hence, in order to prolong the lifespan of the basic device and have the basic device remain useful to the user in the face of increasing technological advancement, the use of modules that augments the basic device can be of great use.

8. **Claims 15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Striemer (Patent Number US 6,931,463 B2), DeGeorge (Publication Number US 2003/0135868 A1), and Chiles et al. (Patent Number US 6,581,157 B1) in view of Kelley et al. (Publication Number US 2004/0253944 A1).

As per **claim 15**, while the combination of Striemer, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. discloses “the system” (see rejection to **claim 1** above), Kelley et al. discloses “*wherein a set of user preferences for an entertainment device is included on said one or more functionality devices (the RF-ID device is programmed to store the user preferences; Page 4, paragraph 0047).*”

Striemer, DeGeorge, Chiles et al., and Kelley et al. are analogous art in that they are from the same field of device interfacing, particularly of peripheral devices to a main device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the method as disclosed by the combination of Striemer, DeGeorge, and Chiles et al. with elements of Kelley et al., which notes that it is desirable to provide a way for users to upgrade the capability of their devices (in this case phones) without having to purchase an entirely new replacement phone **[Page 1,**

Art Unit: 2182

paragraph 0005]. Furthermore, by including user preferences the user can utilize any similar device without being tied to one particular device **[Page 4, paragraph 0047]**.

As per **claim 16**, the combination of Striemer, DeGeorge, Chiles et al., and Kelley et al. discloses “*the system*” (see rejection to **claim 1** above). Kelley et al. further discloses “*wherein said set of user preferences is transferable to a new entertainment device after relocating said one or more functionality devices to said new entertainment device (Pages 4-5, paragraph 0047).*”

RELEVANT ART CITED BY THE EXAMINER

9. The following prior art made of record and relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in the applicant's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See **MPEP 707.05(c)**.

U.S. PATENT NUMBERS:

2003/0038849 A1

2003/0200371 A1

7,010,624 B1

7,424,707 B2

CLOSING COMMENTS

Conclusion

10. The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HENRY YU whose telephone number is (571)272-9779. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TARIQ HAFIZ can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/566,001

Page 18

Art Unit: 2182

/H. Y./

Examiner, Art Unit 2182

November 3, 2010

/Tariq Hafiz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2182